

[Continued from last page.]

will do, he will be entitled to our lasting admiration. That sort of flattery to the people would not take at all with "the people" in any part of the world, and I should be sorry to think it would tickle the people very much anywhere. A man is no worse as a man because he does not possess the learning and political experience which are requisite to fit him for the station of Chief Magistrate of the United States. Nobody pretends to that. But it is a great evil when every body thinks he is fit to be President; and if my friend from Indiana should stand up before a crowd of honest Democrats in my State and talk to "the people," the "real people," the "masses" there, the men who drive their own ploughs, make their own cars, &c., quietly pursue their occupations at home—about NOMINATING ONE OF THEM FOR PRESIDENT, they would do what I will not laugh in his face, and tell him he might as well talk of getting a blacksmith to mend watches.

But let me ask the attention of Senators whilst I give to the Baltimore resolution a more particular notice. It has been often referred to in the Senate, and no one has answered. I believe the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Breese) is entitled to the distinction of having first read it in the Senate. He did not have the Secretary to read it, but read it himself. Next year for the next time! The Senate, having no wish to misrepresent me, need not be asked to remember that I shall have nothing to say against the Convention or its members. The resolution which has been gravely read, and often relied upon as deserving great weight and consideration in our deliberations, is my subject, not the Convention. The resolution on Oregon is simply this: The declaration of opinions by a party Convention recommending those opinions to the people which were unanimously adopted by the Convention. That is its precise character. They are before me:

"Resolved, That our title to the whole of Oregon is clear and unquestionable; that no portion of the same ought to be ceded to England or any other Power; and that the re-annexation of Oregon, and the re-annexation of Texas, at the earliest practicable period, are great American measures, which this Convention recommends to the cordial support of the Democratic party of this Union."

It is remarkable how this resolution has acquired so much importance now, when it was not even thought worthy of being communicated to Mr. Polk at that time by its authors. I have before me, in Niles's Register, the letter informing him of his nomination, and expecting to elect him; and his reply accepting the nomination, hoping they may. That is about the whole of it. In good taste, and enough said. If any Senator wishes it, I will read the letters. Here they are. But not a word about Oregon—not a syllable. No pledges made, and none required. In truth, we all know that the Baltimore Convention was not called to instruct or express opinions for the party, but simply to choose a DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE. So you come round again to Mr. Polk's opinion voluntarily expressed before he was a candidate for President, and which he had not changed to this day. Of that I have already spoken.

Then whom does this resolution bind? Why brought into this Senate? But before you answer me, recollect there were two Baltimore Conventions. [Some person said, "three."] I know, but I don't count the Tyler Convention. [A good deal of laughter took place at this remark, and Mr. H. said, "I mean no sneer—no offence to any one."] The Tyler Convention, I suppose it will be admitted, are not bound by the Democratic Convention resolution. [Mr. Dickinson of New York, and others said, "Of course not."] Then that is settled. How is it with a Democratic Senator whose State voted for Mr. Clay and repudiated the Democratic Convention? That is my case. My State adopted the Constitution many years ago; and besides that, they refused to vote for Mr. Polk, or to approve this resolution in 1844. What is it expected of ME to do? To obey the Constitution, and follow the people of my State; or this resolution of a Convention sent to Baltimore to NOMINATE A CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT, but not to make CREEDS for the party? [Some one remarked, "Of course you are not bound as a Senator."] Very well; it is as a Senator I talk here, as a Senator I vote here, and as a Senator I heard these resolutions read here; and yet as a Senator I am not bound to heed them. That is a strange result, after all we have heard of this matter. And in behalf of my Democratic neighbors, the Senators from South Carolina, I would respectfully inquire whether they were bound, and how far—since South Carolina would not join the Convention, and had no delegates in it. [Several voices: "Oh, yes; her delegates came in after."] I understand it: South Carolina delegates came into the nomination. However, I suspect that much of all this, intended or not intended, will be used to aid the cry of "Panic faith"—"Panic faith!" of which I shall speak hereafter.

But in the next place, Mr. President, I presume to tell my Democratic associates who thrust this new CREED upon me as a test of orthodoxy in the party, that they seem to me not to understand it themselves, and it were as well to look to that before any cry of treason shall be got up, either against the President, or against the Senate, or against an humble individual like myself. I charge the Senator from Illinois, and all other Senators who subscribe this as a CREED, and yet go for 54° 40' with insisting upon more than the Baltimore Convention have recommended the party to believe and do; and here is my proof. It is truly said that Texas and Oregon are "great American" questions. You insist that Oregon is a "Western" question; and sometimes it is stated by you as a party question; and I am afraid that, by bringing it here, you will soon induce other persons (without Senators intending it) to convert it into a very dangerous presidential, sectional, anti-Democratic, anti-Administration question, & teach others to PROSCRIBE those who cannot lay aside our original faith as we do our clothes; and, therefore, still believe that this is an "American" question, and that, like Texas, the "twin sister to Oregon," the boundaries of Oregon ought to be left to a settlement by negotiation through the President and Senate of the United States—the only constitutional organs for treating with foreign Governments.

But more than that, Mr. President; this CREED is in favor of the "RE-OCCUPATION OF OREGON." And that is what I recommended to our party. Ah! "re-occupation"; that's the word; not occupation, but re-occupation. Now we cannot re-occupy what we never occupied before. We never occupied the Oregon that lies north of the compromise line of 49° before, but the Oregon on this side of that line we have heretofore occupied. Therefore we cannot re-occupy north of 49°, but we can re-occupy all south of that line. And that is exactly what the President has been endeavoring to do, and exactly what I am in favor of doing, "fight or no fight." Sir, if a Democrat thus comes fully up to this creed by his action, what gave Senators here the privilege to denounce him as untrue to the Democratic faith? This construction of the

creed is not hypocritical. What is "OREGON"? The country on the Columbia river and south of it—all lying below the line of 49°—must be Oregon. The old historians, maps, geographers, all had it so. It is a thing of modern origin to call any part of the territory north of 49° "OREGON." There is, then an old Oregon and a modern Oregon. The old Oregon was once occupied by us. Outside of that we have never occupied any portion of the modern Oregon; and therefore, if this CREED had gone for an occupation of Oregon, it might well be construed "all of Oregon," old and new. But, as it only went for a "re-occupation," it is as clear as day that the CREED must be interpreted to mean the old Oregon up to 49°; that same Oregon which we once occupied; that same Oregon which lies south of 49°; that same Oregon which the DEMOCRATS all go for still, only some of us are not anxious to fight for ANY MORE. If we stand to the faith, and keep the bond as it was written for us, will not that suffice? I think, Mr. President, I have disposed of the Baltimore resolutions, generally and specially.

With unaffected pain did I hear a charge of "PUNIC FAITH" brought and repeated against the south in this Senate with respect to this Oregon notice, &c., and in a way that challenged a reply to it.

Personally I care nothing about it, as I voted for the Oregon bill last session; and some Senators know that my reason for voting against it the session before was that its form appeared to me to violate the Constitution. [Mr. H. here explained at length his objections to the form of that notice. He also excused himself for voting to take up the Oregon question at this session, by stating that he had known at the time (as he does now) how the negotiation then stood, he would not have voted for so much of that bill as proposed to take jurisdiction. But the Senate did not know the facts at that time, and they had not been told to him. He did not wonder at the offence that was taken by the British Parliament, who, no doubt, believed that we knew it all at the time the bill passed the other House.] But I do not feel myself at liberty to let such an accusation grow into a proverb against the south. The south is my home; and such accusations have a baleful influence in kindling and preserving sectional feelings; I shall, therefore, expose its injustice, and then forbear. I shall do that by the Journals of the Senate now before me. I will read from the books if any of my statements should be questioned. This charge of "Panic faith," the Senate will remember, was introduced here some days ago, when the honorable Senator from Georgia (Mr. Colquitt) had spoken of the course of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hannegan) upon the Texas question. The honorable Senator from Indiana said, in substance, as I understood him, (I have not his words before me,) that he had for some time desired a fit occasion to explain his vote against Texas, and now he had it; and that it was simply because he had foreseen, "Panic faith—panic faith." Then, or at some other time, he more than intimated that he had found that Panic faith in the south. Other Senators were formally called to the floor to vindicate that Senator by their statements, showing that he really was suspicious of the south, of which I do not complain. Altogether the complexion given to this matter before the public eye was, that this "Panic faith" had been practised by one or more southern Senators of the Democratic party; and the sagacity of the honorable Senator, it seems, enabled him to see it beforehand. In that way he explained his vote against Texas.

Now, Mr. President, there is a grave mistake in all this thing. In the first place, the Senators' memory deceived him as to the fact of his own vote. He did not vote against Texas! Upon the treaty he did not vote at all! For the Texas resolutions, the next session, he voted *aye*. The Journals are before me, and these are facts. If contradicted, I will read the votes. [Mr. Hannegan remarked: "I was present, and did not vote on the treaty."] Mr. Haywood. No doubt of it; but present or absent was all the same. No single vote was worth having upon the treaty; for every body knew in the Senate, almost from the beginning, that the treaty could not pass. The Senator will admit that. Then what basis for his charge is left? In the second place, Mr. President, the resolution for notice, &c., on Oregon was rejected at that session—before the Baltimore Convention met! It was rejected by *eyes and noses* on the 21st of March! The convention met on 27th May! Now, what does the Senator think of his charge of "Panic faith," Panic faith?"

In the third place, every Democratic Senator save two—the two from South Carolina, (Messrs. Huger and McDuffie)—voted for the Oregon bill upon the test vote in the Senate at the session when Texas was passed through by the Senator's vote. The Senator from Indiana at that session held Texas in his hand—his single hand! Without his vote it could not have passed! Oregon lacked one vote to save it, Texas but one vote to kill it. What claim will he set up for sagacity, and upon what grounds can he make this charge against the South, when he had only to have made the passage of the Oregon bill *sine qua non* to his vote for Texas, and the thing would have been done—both would have passed, or neither. The Oregon bill must have passed—always provided he could have got a Southern Senator to make such a bargain with him! He had but two Senators to trade with; for all the rest of us voted for the Oregon bill without a price. That he did not drive a bargain for Oregon is no concern of mine.

[Mr. HAYWOOD here spoke of Mr. HUGER as an absent friend, whom he loved too well not to vindicate against unjust aspersions, and was about to proceed; when— Mr. HANNEGAN at once interrupted him by expressing the highest admiration and respect for Mr. HUGER, and disavowed all sort of intention to impute to him an act, or even a thought, of the slightest dishonor as a man or a Senator.]

Mr. HAYWOOD continued. That is enough, Mr. President. The other honorable Senator from South Carolina (Mr. McDuffie) is here, and very able to vindicate himself if he thinks it is required. But I turn to higher topics. This is not a pleasant one.

Mr. President coming to the conclusions I have which have been expressed to the Senate without evasion or disguise, and in taking my stand as I believe, alongside of the Executive department of the Government, I look no counsel of Great Britain's strength to make me recede from the extreme claim of my own country. Were it Mexico, or any still weaker and more distracted Government, if I know my own heart, I would demand no more from it than I would insist upon against Great Britain—our rights, our honorable rights, peaceably and in love. From neither, and from no other Government in the world, would I take what was not honorable for my own demand; nor go to war with any nation for either a profitable or an unprofitable wrong. I must be pardoned, therefore, for giving utterance to the sentiment, that an accusation of this kind against our own Government was neither just, nor politic, nor patriotic. The rest of the world will be easy to persuade, with American Senators to instruct them, that our country is mean enough to oppress the weak, and too cowardly to assert our rights against the strong. Great Britain will hardly find in that (if she believed it) a motive for surrendering all from Oregon without a fight even if it should become necessary for her to fight us single-handed for it.

So, before God and the Senate, I do abjure

and reprobate the sentiment of hatred to any nation as a motive for going back no further than the offered compromise.

The venerated man whose image hangs constantly before us, and whose name should ever be his eulogy in an American Senate—GEORGE WASHINGTON—in his last words to the country, taught us that "the nation which indulges towards another habitual hatred is in some degree a slave"; and the Declaration of American Independence has sanctified it has a political maxim of this Republic, "to hold Great Britain as we hold the rest of mankind ENEMIES [only] in war but in peace FRIENDS." There is nothing that has tempted me to forget, and nothing shall drive me to violate, the counsel of my country's father, nor this fundamental maxim of free American institutions. Neither will I teach the people to do it. Good men could not applaud the Senate for it. Heaven would not excuse its practical application, nor fail perhaps to visit the consequences upon the nation itself.

Without going into our title to the territory, (which, if the Senate choose, can be done hereafter, and whenever the bill for taking jurisdiction over Oregon, or "any portion of it," comes up for consideration,) I will tell you in very few words the ground of rights upon which (if there were no other) I would put my vindication. I believe it is the political RIGHT of my country to stretch itself, without any interruption by foreign Governments, from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from sea to sea on this continent—according as we ourselves shall judge it expedient or not. That we acquired that RIGHT upon this continent when our INDEPENDENCE was established, subject only to the proviso that we must not do so as to deny the like privilege to our neighbors, nor interfere with settlements permanently made before our independence was established, nor with similar rights belonging to or acquired by them; nor act with injustice to the *aborigines*. What we claim a right to do we must not deny to the CANADAS. It is a sort of a national pre-emption right to both. Great Britain cannot rightfully complain so long as we do not deny to her, as the mother country of the Canadas, the same right equally with ourselves. She cannot rightfully interrupt our enjoyment of that right. And if she does, then we CANNOT SUBMIT TO IT.

Our dividing line is at 49° on this side of the mountains; and if it is straitened to the Pacific on the other in harmony we ought to be satisfied. In settling that line between the two Governments, the great law of "love and good will to man" requires concessions for equivalents, to be agreed for by mutual consent; and they should be mutually made for the convenience of each other; and such are fit subjects for friendly negotiation. This Senate, Mr. President, are more familiar with the doctrines and the learning of books about *contingency and continuity* than I profess to be; and they might well complain of me if I enlarged on those topics. My constituents are a plain republican people, who generally do not care to be enlightened by such treatises. As many of them as do will read for themselves. By the Constitution they have entrusted the making of TREATIES with the President and the Senate. They are satisfied with the Constitution as it is, and patriotically disposed in all parties to take sides with their country. I mean "the People" are. They will feel and understand this assertion of our right to grow and multiply when in the providence of God the country wants to do it; and I doubt not it will vindicate me. At any rate, they put me in this Senate to act on questions of this sort, questions of treaty-making, and to advise the President according to my best judgment upon the responsibility of my own conscience, and I shall govern myself accordingly; accountable to God that my motives are good to my associates that my speech be frank, to the people only that I DO RIGHT.

What the end of these things may be, if the Senate shall come to the same conclusion with me must depend upon the course Great Britain may pursue, or may not pursue, upon the subject of a compromise. Of that I know nothing. I only know what she ought to do, & that I trust in God she will do. One thing is certain—it will bring us to the end. If it does not aid negotiation it will hinder it.

I believe Great Britain desires peace because it is her interest to do it. Her Minister is still here—the Minister of Peace—the Minister of Peace from a Christian people and a Christian Government. Why should we doubt the result? He will hardly leave before he has at least told us what is "a FURTHER PROPOSAL MORE CONSISTENT WITH FAIRNESS AND EQUITY," which he trusted the American Government would make to him. (pp. 11, 69.) Sir, the civilized world would exonerate the Minister of both Governments if this negotiation should be terminated upon any point of personal or diplomatic etiquette. Christian lands are not to be involved in wars at this day for the personal pique of their agents. Ministers of peace do not seek occasion for a quarrel; but, if really inclined to compromise, they would be looked upon as miserable bunglers, when either of both of them cannot find in their own correspondence, or elsewhere, a reason or a pretext for making any offer that would prove acceptable to both. If THERE BE ANY SUCH, leave all that to them, and there let the responsibility rest, undivided by us.

This matter can be compromised, if the two Governments are willing to do it. If Great Britain does not intend to compromise, we ought to know it; let her not have the excuse for it, that the President was against "all compromise," but in favor of all Oregon territory. She shall not be permitted to say that this misconception of the American President, although proclaimed by the American Senate by some Senators, was neither refuted nor contradicted by any other. This notice is not at all; and I do not expect it is either to intimidate Great Britain or to offend her. But hitherto neither of the two Governments seem to have fully realized the necessity of terminating this last cause of dispute between them, and of opening the way wider for the cultivation of a permanent national concord.

Whatever may be their course or their condition, it seems to me that WE are no longer left at liberty to postpone a final settlement of this whole controversy about Oregon. The public will, expressed through their immediate delegates in the other House, is very conclusive upon that point. Another Presidential election, and every other question will be made subordinate to this one for "Our Rights."

The public mind, already pre-occupied by one-sided arguments upon our title to the whole of Oregon, will be in no state to discuss it; the people will be excited and misled by denunciations against every man who has the moral courage hereafter to doubt it, and even taught to call him "British;" the prudence of age will be deceived as the counsel of a foreign influence by a hired press; the wisdom of statesmen will be set aside by the clamors of selfish demagogues; the love of peace and the fear of God denominated by factions, and vilified by traitor associations, as the cowardice of traitors and the affectation of hypocrisy. It will soon become the unholy work of an infuriated party spirit, aided by selfish ambition, to create and produce in our happy country this, and much more than this—all, as I apprehend, for the sake of putting great men down, and exalting little men to high places, more than it will be for the purpose of securing our national rights. Senators and others who would scorn to play the game are incautiously furnishing the cards—"All of Oregon or none."

Our title is "clear and unquestionable"—"The Administration is with us"—"Down with the treacherous Democrat or British Whig who opens his mouth for compromise!" These cries will be so many obstacles to peace—honorable peace. As we would keep the poor over the subject in the hands of the CONSTITUTION has entrusted it—as we would protect the trust to the course of LIBERTY REGULATED BY LAW, to God, and to our consciences—I think the Senate should aid to bring this controversy to a conclusion, in some way or other, as soon as possible. Another year, and it may be too late to settle it in peace. Another three years' delay, and it will not be settled without a dreadful conflict of political agitations at home, and perhaps a desperate war between two Christian nations. God deliver us from both!

If the trusts of this body under the Constitution must be carried for discussion beforehand to the court-houses and party caucuses of the land—if we must encounter the agitations and perils and bitterness of a popular ordeal in our foreign affairs—will not the Senate agree that it is safer and wiser to take care that the pleadings shall be made up so as to present the TRUE ISSUES? Notice or no notice is an old question—pre-emptory and prejudiced; and the peace of the country can hardly be preserved if we suffer that to be the issue which goes before the country. Let us give the notice, then, to the President's hands, before the negotiation is closed, and if there is a compromise, the question will go to the people upon that. The result is, to my mind, neither doubtful nor fearful. If no compromise that we can accept with honor shall be offered now, it never will be offered; and then we shall soon have the whole subject before us, and can take such steps as will protect our rights and carry this question into our popular elections upon fair and true issues. But there has been a doubt excited lest the President might abuse the notice after we have authorized it, and you hesitate. Is there not more danger from our delay, than in any trust we may repose in the Executive by giving him the use of this notice, even if he should abuse it? Friends of the Administration—DEMOCRATS—surely WE can confide in him, else we ought not to be his friends. Confidence is not to be expected with so much alacrity from those who have been his political opponents, especially when some of ourselves have misconstrued the President. But, Writings of the Senate, do you still doubt his position? Do you fear he may abuse this notice after it is given to him, (as it has been said he would) by abruptly closing negotiation, and even refusing his own offer for a compromise at 49°, should it be returned to him? To such as are resolved to stand by him AT THAT LINE OF COMPROMISE, and to NO OTHER LINE, do I appeal. I have said already that if you do not mean to stop concession at that line, you do right in refusing a notice. He cannot speak upon that point; official propriety forbids it, as I have already said and proved. But there is a guaranty. Let him but venture to occupy that position contrary to your hopes and expectations. Let him only attempt to betray the confidence you put in his conduct. (Oh! he will not do it. I feel like I was defending a friend's honor, when I say again, and again, that this constant CONFESSION CANNOT be true.) But what if he should attempt it? The country will yet be safe. He might embarrass the Senate, but he would destroy himself. The moment he does it, the whole subject will, by the Constitution, pass out of his hands, and fall EXCLUSIVELY INTO OURS. The Legislative, and not the Executive department, will thereafter have it in charge; with no change but the abrogation of a convention that is so rashness in us to continue longer in force. We have a majority here for peace, and for every honorable means of preserving it—no more, but all that—men who, I am sure, would defy faction, and laugh at demagogism in the crisis of their country's fate—Democrats and Whigs, all patriots and together upon an "AMERICAN" question.

And the bill for extending our jurisdiction over Oregon need not to be, as it ought not to be, adopted, until we see what course the President will take, and what Great Britain means to do. And this Senate ought not to adjourn until we know whether we are to have PEACE or a SWORD. IT SHALL NOT BE MY VOTE. It would not be becoming in me to undertake to advise how we ought to act in such a case upon subsequent measures. Though I do not admire the common use of Scripture quotations in political speeches, the subject and the occasion appear to be solemn and impressive enough to excuse me for saying upon that point, "Sufficient upon the day is the evil thereof."

I come now to invite the attention of the Senate to some of the several forms in which it has been proposed that this notice shall be authorized. The resolution reported from the committee on Foreign Affairs was not at all objectionable to my mind in the outset. For nothing on its face do I now think that resolution objectionable. But other Senators were not satisfied with it, and preferred to pursue a different form of words; and I have held myself ready at all times to adopt any form that might be more acceptable to others, so long as the substance was not sacrificed. If I could desire to put Senators of any party in a false position upon a question of this kind, I should despise myself. The resolution and preamble offered by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Crittenden,) when it was proposed, seemed to me to arrive at the object, substantially, by another form of words, perhaps better, perhaps not; any way, I was, at the beginning, and I am now, contented to take that. I like it—I approve it. But I should like to see it altered, by striking out the proviso which delays the notice until after the present session of Congress. My reasons have been already stated. Should they make no impression upon the judgment of the Senate, I do not expect to make that proviso a reason for voting against that amendment. The preamble, although not originally necessary, was, perhaps, expedient, on account of the course of the debates which sprung up in the Senate, and connected themselves with OREGON, and the introduction of the proposition of the Senator from Kentucky. (Mr. Crittenden) was at once a wise and patriotic movement, to check the progress of unnecessary alarm in the country. With the lights at that time before us, I think it was so. Though I knew nothing of it until it was proposed by him, in my heart I thanked him for it. That Senator is a better judge than I am, whether all the valuable and patriotic purposes designed by him have not been fully accomplished. The difference between authorization: the President to give the notice at his discretion, and a law annulling the treaty and directing him to give the notice, does not seem to be very material; and if it were, I would suggest that the House resolution leaves it to his discretion, as well as the resolution of the Senator from Kentucky. I am willing to vote for either of the three, as may be most agreeable to others.

The amendment suggested by the honorable Senator from Georgia (Mr. Colquitt) I cannot vote for—the last resolution. I sat down to examine it, with a sincere desire to approve, if I could; but I cannot, and I regret it on many accounts. The words are as follows:—"Sec. 2. And be it further resolved, That it is earnestly desired that the long-standing controversy respecting limits in the Oregon territory, be speedily settled, by negotiation and compromise, in order to tranquility the public mind, and to preserve the friendly relations of the two countries." I object to this, because, although circumstances may make it proper or excusable in a Senator or Senators to express his or their individual opinions upon a negotiation in a debate, yet this Senate, as a Senate, ought not to do it, and we ought not to take charge of a negotiation ending at the Executive Department. The Constitution has left all that to the President, unless he asks the Senate for advice; and that advice should then proceed from the Senate alone, acting in Executive session, not from Congress. This Senate may be more

competent to conduct a negotiation than President Polk, but the CONSTITUTION has determined that matter otherwise; and, "by the Constitution," President Polk is the wiser and safer negotiator. We must not gain say that our resolutions as a Senate. If it be our right, I should question the expediency of giving any advice unasked. If we were ever so competent by the Constitution to give the advice unasked, and it were not inexpedient to do it for other reasons, yet it is entirely unnecessary in this case. The negotiation is pending upon the basis of "compromise," and we have the President's declaration to the British Minister that he has "determined to pursue it to a conclusion" upon that basis. Indeed, Senators know that after the basis. Indeed, Senators know that after the basis was once arranged by mutual consent, it was not in the power of one of them to change that basis without the consent of the other, or else terminating the negotiation.

I object to it further, because if the SENATE has a right to advise, and it would be prudent and wise to give the advice, still it cannot be pretended that CONGRESS has such a power under the Constitution; and it is one of the first and highest duties of the Senate to protect the peculiar trusts which, under the Constitution, appertain to it, and not to admit, much less to invite, the House of Representatives into partnership for advising the President upon our foreign affairs. By adding this amendment to a joint resolution, we violate that duty ourselves, and consent to and invite an encroachment upon the Senate; and that forms to my mind a conclusive objection. Were there no other, it ought to prevail.

I object to it further, because, if it is intended as a declaration of our "earnest desire" made to a foreign Government, and addressed to it, then it is very unusual, if it be not a reflection upon our Chief Magistrate, who is the "only mouth" of this Government to speak to other nations; and that, after he has already told Great Britain that he "desires" a compromise. Once enough, I would give no room for an inference that we distrusted him or his peaceful purposes. It is proper that we should give him the moral weight of our legislative opinion by act or resolution for notice, and leave him to use it the best way he can, but still responsible for any abuse of it. There I hope we shall stop. Give all the aid he asks, but no impediments. Thereafter I would make no more calls for correspondence, but leave the Ministers to carry through the negotiation. Our calls may be embarrassing to both of them. They are not calculated to aid our own.

There is another objection to this resolution that is conclusive to my own mind, and I ask particular attention to it. If I interpret it aright, it advises a compromise between 49 degrees and the Columbia river. Now to that I cannot agree.

In the sixth protocol are these words: The British Minister said "that he did not feel authorized to enter into a discussion respecting the territory north of the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, which was understood by the British Government to form the basis of negotiation on the side of the United States, as the line of the Columbia formed that on the side of Great Britain." To this, I apprehend, our Government assented by signing the protocol, and Mr. Pakenham has ever since treated the matter accordingly. Then the "pending controversy" respecting limits is understood to be a controversy whether those limits shall be settled at 49° or at the Columbia river; and our advice to settle it by compromise would be to advise to compromise, viz. to give and take for a line between these two. I do not say it was so intended: I am sure it was not. But see how much difficulty there is in agreeing upon our construction of the message. Shall we not multiply embarrassment by every step of our interference with negotiations?

Suppose that mine was not the proper interpretation of this resolution. It must be admitted not to be free of doubt. That is sufficient to condemn it for it may mislead Great Britain. Her Minister may understand it as I do, and the consequence will be that no offer that we can accept will be made. Upon the whole, I submit to the Senate that the House resolutions, under all the circumstances now surrounding this subject, had better be adopted by the Senate. Their second resolution is but a proviso excluding any inference that that House designed by the first one to obtrude into a subject belonging to the President and Senate. It was perhaps a right for them to say so. It was but saying to us and to the President, "As a negotiation is pending, and this House claims no right to interrupt it, we have taken care to declare that negotiation is a matter with which the people's Representatives in the House do not hereby interfere." And, at the same time the vote on their part implied the absence of any hostility to negotiation upon this subject, and at this stage of it, negotiation means compromise. From that there is no escape.

The great reason why I would entreat the Senate to take the House resolutions, so free of objection as they are, is this: The difference, if any, in favor of either of the other propositions over those from the House, is not to be compared to the inconvenience (using no stronger expression) which the sending of this discussion back to the other House will produce in the country, and the certain delay and probable embarrassments it will lead to in pursuing the negotiation. The whole subject is with the Senate: with the Senate I leave it.

Mr. President, I have now concluded what I had to say. I must be more or less than a man if I felt so indifferent to the kind and flattering attention of the Senate for two days, as not to express my gratitude for it. I have spoken plainly of principles and things—I hope not too much so.—It is difficult I know to do that without an appearance of disrespect to those you answer. But an attack upon errors of opinion is no assault upon the persons holding them. In my heart there is nothing of unkindness. If I had not been placed, most reluctantly, in an attitude where I must speak or be misunderstood; if I had not been goaded by repeated declarations which I could not assent to, and which, if correct, it knew would force me to oppose the Administration and to abandon a friend; and which, if not correct, it was my duty and my right as a Senator to refute in free debate, I should not have opened my mouth. If not so, it is a performance of an unavoidable duty should leave me exposed to misrepresentation. I must bear it. My hands are clean, my heart is easy, my conscience is unburdened; and, if I have done any thing for good I can rejoice, if not, I have tried to do it. And, having confidence in God stronger than any "confidence in princes," I pray that HE who rules the destiny of nations may guide our counsels so as to save the peace of my beloved country, and protect it forever by His mighty arm in the enjoyment of liberty and religion.

**J. LEONARD, BLACK-SMITH,** respectfully informs the citizens of Wilmington, and the surrounding country, that he has located his BLACK-SMITH establishment in the Shop recently occupied by Mr. L. Wood, near Messrs. Hall & Armstrong's Distillery, where he is prepared to execute every description of work in his line, viz: Mill and Steam Boat work, make or repair Boilers, and all kinds of Edged Tools, Ploughs, &c. &c., in a substantial and neat manner.

He solicits a share of the public patronage, and will always endeavor to give satisfaction. WILMINGTON, January 30, 1846. 20-1y

**RICE**—60 Casks fresh best, prime quality for sale by G W DAVIS.

**WANTED**—The highest CASH PRICE will be paid for OLD PEWTER, by J. HART & POLLEY. 20-4f

**J. W. W. GORDON, Druggist,** No. 1 2 West Pratt st., a few doors from Light st., and opposite the Balt. & Ohio R. R. Depot, Baltimore, February 18, 1846 24-3m

**STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.** SAMSON COUNTY. Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions. February Term, 1846. James Moore, executor of James Moore, deceased, vs. Jane Moore, Thomas O. Moore, James King, guardian of minor heirs of Walter O. Moore, deceased, John T. Moore and wife, Curtis Thompson and wife, Benjamin Brothers and wife, Harriet O. Moore, and Henry N. Moore.

T appearing that Thomas O. Moore, Benjamin Brothers and wife, and James King, guardian of minor heirs of Walter O. Moore, dec'd, reside beyond the limits of this State; Ordered, by this Court, that publication be made for six successive weeks in the Wilmington Journal and Fayetteville Observer, for the said Thomas O. Moore, Benjamin Brothers and wife, and James King, guardian, to appear at the next term of the Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, held for the county of Sampson, in Clinton, on the third Monday in May next, and show cause why the last will and testament of James Moore, dec'd, shall not be admitted to solemn and final probate.

Witness, T. I. Faison, Clerk of our said Court at office, in Clinton, the 3rd Monday in February, A. D. 1846, and 70th year of American Independence. T. I. FAISON, C. C. C. March 6, 1846 28-9f

## DIAGUERRETYPE MINIATURES.

MR. HUMPHREY would respectfully announce to the citizens of Wilmington, that he purposes remaining in this place a short time, and of giving all an opportunity of procuring a correct likeness of themselves and friends in his superior style.

Having connection with three of the most successful Daguerreotype Rooms in the State of New York, he has advantages which but few artists can realize.

Portraits taken in a superior style, perfectly true to nature, of very fine tone, gilded and colored so that no climate will effect them in the least. Daguerreotypes taken by the old process, gilded and colored so as to render them equal to those taken at the present day.

Portraits of sick or deceased persons taken at their residences if required.

Particular attention given to those wishing to engage in the business. Instruction with all the latest improvements, apparatus and stock, furnished on reasonable terms.

For further information inquire at his room, on Front street up stairs adjoining Dr. Wm. S. directly opposite the Chronicle Office. January 30, 1846. 20-4f

## FRESH DRUGS AND MEDICINES.

**DR. A. C. EVANS,** HAS RECEIVED, at the NEW DRUG STORE, in addition to a full and complete stock of genuine

Drugs, Medicines, Paints, Oils, Dye Stuffs, and a great variety of miscellaneous articles, 100 kegs White Lead, No 1 to pure, 75 boxes Window Glass, 8X10 to 12X16, 50 lbs. Mercurials, 100 oz. Sulph. Quinine, 12 lbs Oil, 25 cans Verdigris and Chrome Green, 1000 lbs English and American Epsom Salts, 7 doz. Salad Oil, 12 gross bottled Soda, (a fine article,) 6 doz. Trusses, including Chases, Ivory pad, Hull's, Marsh's, &c., (all sizes)

Sulphate and Acid. Morphine. McMurra's Elixer of Opium. Iodine. Iodide of Potassa and Iron, Strychnia. Pimper. Henry's Magnesia. Husband's fluid Magnesia. Elixirum, Farr's Ext. Bark, Oils, Cereals and Copiva. Granville's Lotions, Wood's Naphtha. Castor Oil Candy, (a good purgative for children.) French Mustard, &c., with the following PATENT MEDICINES:

Wistar's Balsam Wild Cherry. Swayne's Syrup of do., Taylor's Balsam Liverwort, Moffat's Phoenix Bitters, Jayne's Expectant and Hair Tonic, Swain's Pannace. Fabnestock's Vermifuge, Sand's Sarsaparilla, Indian Pannace, Chera-mo's Balsam, Thompson's Eye Water, Gray's Ointment, Beckwith's, Peter's, Lee's, Leidy's, Moffat's and Brandreth's Pills, &c. &c.

A liberal supply of all articles in the line, will be constantly kept on hand, at a considerable reduction on customary prices.

Physicians and Merchants will find it to their interest to call before going forth.

All articles warranted genuine or returned. July 18th, 1845. 44

## ADAMS & M'GARY

HAVE OPENED their store in the Parsley buildings, between Chestnut and Walnut streets, where they have and will keep a large assortment of GROCERIES, SHIP STORES and PROVISIONS, among which will be found

6 chds. P. R. and St. 20 Tubs Butter, Croix Sugars, 50 boxes scaled Herings, 50 bags Coffee, 30 boxes Sp'm Candles, 50 bbls Canal Flour, 10 do brown Soap, 40 half do. do, 80 kegs White Lead, 50 bbls Mess & Prime Beef, 20 1/2 bbls Fulton Market Beef, 40 bbls do. do, 20 1/2 " No. 1 and 2 Mackerel, 100 lbs Pilot and Navy Bread, 40 M Segars, assorted, 4 barrels and boxes Crackers, SADDLERY, 25 bbls Whiskey, Smoked Beef & Tongues, 20 do Rum, Oils and Paints, 10 do Brandy, Fine Liquors, 20 do Gin, All kinds of Cordage, 40 chests and 1/2 chests A general assortment of Tea, A liberal assortment of Groceries, 10 casks Cheese, ALSO—Some very superior TEAS, for family use, in half pound, quatrone and canisters. N28 11-4f

## TO MERCHANTS.

Physicians, and Others.

THE subscriber keeps constantly for sale, at the lowest prices, an assortment of MEDICINES, DRUGS, DYE STUFFS, PAINTS, OILS, GLASS, VARNISH, BRUSHES, &c. &c. Confident that his prices will give satisfaction, he solicits even those who may not intend to purchase at the time, to ascertain the prices of his goods.

Any communications, asking the prices of goods, are most cheerfully and promptly answered. He would particularly state, that he has a Steam Factory in connection with his store, for Powdering, Jalap, Rhubarb, Ipecacuanha, and many other Medicines; for grinding Mustard, Cinnamon, Ginger, Allspice, Pepper, Cloves, &c.; and Lamp Black, Black Lead, Venetian Red, Chrome yellow and green, Venetian, Yellow Ochre, and other Paints, in oil; all of which he is able to sell at the very lowest prices.

Points mixed already for use, and put up in earthen pots, of different sizes